

As broadcasters on the public airwaves Sinclair Broadcasting owe every American an objective look at the world and its news. When they broadcast a wholly biased movie on one candidate (as wrong as that is) they owe it to the people to air an equal portrayal of the other incumbent as well (there are several, they have their choice). In the days of the fairness doctrine this would not have been an issue, but seeing as how you've ruled against it, you now owe it to the people to scrutinize specific instances where personal ownership and biased opinion are sold to the public free of charge.

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.